



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

defeated could not be brought up again for five years, was lost. Another proviso of this proposed amendment required that every amendment must be submitted and voted on separately.

ARTHUR CONNERS.

*Bureau of Legislative Information  
Indianapolis, Ind.*

### **Administration and Supervision of State Charities and Corrections.**

There is little uniformity among the charity and correction systems of the various commonwealths of the United States, either in statutory law or in the practical working out of the system. No two States have the same law, and States with similar laws work out their problems in many different ways, owing primarily to the different conditions which confront the State or to the different development of charity problems in each State. However, state supervision or administration, through a state board, is now almost universal. Of the forty-eight States, forty-two have some form of supervision by the State. Six have no state supervision except such perfunctory inspection as may be made by the governor or legislature at annual or biennial intervals, the whole power over state institutions resting with the individual boards of trustees.

There are at least seventy boards and commissions in the United States which deal with some part of the problem of state supervision of charities and corrections. Of these, four consist of a single individual. Alabama has a state prison inspector, New Jersey a state commissioner of charities and corrections, New York a fiscal supervisor of charitable institutions and Oklahoma a state commissioner of charities and corrections. There are several minor state boards such as the Ohio and Massachusetts commissions for the blind and the New Jersey state board of Children's guardians.

For purposes of analyses, however, the larger state boards may be divided and classified according to the three main divisions of the general field of charities. Those fields are broadly (1) penal and reformatory institutions; (2) institutions for the insane; and (3) strictly charitable institutions. In a few States such as Alabama, Georgia, Nevada and Texas, the only state board is that over penal institutions—the prison commission as it is called. Twelve States have such boards over their penal institutions, usually, however, with another board in at least one of the other fields. Seven States have separate boards over the insane.

By far the most common, however, are those States which have but

a single board over all three fields. There are twenty-two States with such a single board over all three fields. Four States have two boards over the three fields; that is, either a single board over the insane and charitable institutions with a separate prison commission over the penal institutions, or a charity board over both the penal and charitable institutions, with a separate board over the insane. Massachusetts and New York have a separate board for each of the three fields, while California has separate boards for each field with an additional fiscal board over all.

Again some States have two boards over the same institutions—the “dual system” as it is called, which is described later on. One of the boards is administrative or fiscal, the other is supervisory. These States are California, Illinois, Minnesota, Nebraska, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island and South Dakota.

In the duties and powers of boards in the same State there is also wide discrepancy. The prison commission may be administrative, the charity board supervisory. There may be a dual system over the charities, while in the same State the prison commission may be supervisory and the lunacy commission administrative, as is the case in New York.

Again there is considerable difference in the scope of the authority of all of these boards. Some may be strictly confined to the supervision of state institutions, while others may have power of inspecting and investigating local and county institutions and even private charity organizations. Some may be given duties which emphasize the fiscal side of the institutions, while others may be specifically forbidden to interfere in any way with the administration of the institutions.

In a few States the boards have control or supervision of certain groups of institutions located close together. Such is particularly the case in Rhode Island. Certain States, including Minnesota, Rhode Island, South Dakota and Vermont have special state boards of visitors to state institutions, while many of the southern and western States with well developed county systems supplement the work of the state boards with boards of county visitors or county boards of charities.

In the main, however, certain tendencies may be noted. The larger States, which have several institutions in the same class; that is, several hospitals for the insane or several penitentiaries tend to divide the work of charity supervision by placing a separate board over such institutions. There is no such tendency in most States, either because the area of the State is small, or because there are but one or two institutions in the same class, so that one board can cover the whole State satisfac-

torily. Each State usually has some one problem predominating—the care of paupers, children, insane or criminals, and such a State tends to develop a board whose essential function is to care for this particular class. Thus in Massachusetts the Board of Charities has two sub-divisions, caring for adult paupers and for dependent children. In Illinois the board of administration finds the insane the chief problem. In Georgia and other southern States where general charity work upon the part of the State is but little developed, the convict presents the chief problem. In nearly every State a large part of charity work still devolves to a considerable extent upon private philanthropic organizations or upon local or municipal organizations. The State Charities Aid Association of New York is the most notable example of such a private organization whose work has been of great importance.

It should always be borne in mind that in the majority of States the administration of institutions is still in the hands of individual boards of trustees rather than under a centralized state board. Thus in at least twenty-nine or 60 per cent of the States, the separate boards of trustees are still charged with the administration of state institutions. Even in States having central administrative boards, the institutions in one or more of the fields of charity supervision may still be under separate boards of trustees. The presence of supervisory boards of charities does not change the function of these individual boards in the slightest degree. Even where there are so-called boards of control, the individual boards of trustees may still exist in the same field, though often with modified powers. This is notably the case in California, New York and Rhode Island.

In spite of this great variety, the various state systems may be divided into three large groups or types—the supervisory, the administrative and the dual. The boards under all of these systems have certain minor characteristics in common. The members are usually appointed by the governor, with or without the advice and consent of the senate. All of the boards are allowed to appoint a secretary, usually at a fixed salary, together with such clerical assistants and special agents as may be necessary. Thus Indiana has a staff of thirteen besides the secretary, while Iowa has fifteen.

To point out the fundamental characteristics of each system, three States are taken as examples. In each of these, the particular system is working with marked success, and the law creating each system is in the main quite typical.

*Indiana* has eighteen state institutions, each of which is administered

in all details by a separate board of trustees. These boards have all powers of appointment, supervise the purchase of supplies, by contract or otherwise, and methods of caring for the inmates. There is absolutely no connection between the managements of the various institutions. State supervision of these institutions is vested in a board of state charities consisting of six members appointed by the governor who is ex-officio member and president of the board. Regular meetings are held quarterly or more frequently if deemed necessary. The members receive no compensation.

The board "shall investigate the whole system of public charities and correctional institutions of the State, examine into the condition and management thereof, especially of prisons, jails, infirmaries, public hospitals and asylums;" may prescribe such forms of reports and registration as it may deem essential to secure accuracy, uniformity and completeness of statistics. All plans for new jails and infirmaries shall, before adoption of the same by the county authorities, be submitted to the board for suggestion and criticism. At its discretion, the board may at any time make an investigation by the whole board or by a committee of its members, of the management of any penal reformatory, or charitable institution of the State, and in such investigation it shall have power to send for persons or papers and to administer oaths and affirmations.

The board has also the supervision of official out-door poor relief; is agent of the State in the supervision of all orphans' homes and associations supported in whole or in part from public funds; visits all institutions caring for neglected or dependent children; passes upon the fitness of associations proposing to incorporate for the purpose of caring for such children; and licenses maternity hospitals and all child caring institutions.

The board appoints a paid secretary who is also allowed his travelling expenses. The secretary is ex-officio member of the state board of truancy.

The powers of the board are entirely supervisory or, as that term is usually understood, advisory. It has no power to interfere in any way with the management of the institutions. The only executive power the board possesses is in passing upon the incorporation of charitable organizations, licensing certain classes of organizations and passing upon plans for jails and lockups.

Indiana also has county boards of charity which report to the State board and greatly supplement its work, This is peculiar to states hav-

ing well organized county systems, and is not, generally an essential element of the supervisory system as a whole.

The success of the Indiana board or system lies primarily in the personnel of the board. During nearly every year of its existence the board has had among its members men not only experts in the charity work of their own State, but men who have had national reputations in charity work.

*Iowa—The Administrative Type.* Iowa has a single centralized board of control, of three members appointed by the governor, each of whom receives a salary of \$3000 per year. The board has full charge over all state charitable institutions, appointing the superintendents and fixing all salaries. For minor employes, it fixes a graded scale of wages. Its fiscal control is emphasized. It receives monthly estimates from the superintendents and lays down laws and rules for the purchasing of supplies. It controls this purchase by estimates and contracts, but the actual buying is done by the heads of each institution. It has also fiscal supervision over the affairs of the educational institutions of the State. It has full powers of investigation, may summons witnesses, administer oaths and compel testimony. It is given power of visitation and inspection over county and private institutions for the insane, and over certain other private institutions. It is in addition given the duty of investigating the whole system of state charities, thus combining with its administrative functions some of the duties of the Indiana supervisory board.

It is usual for boards of this type to appoint only the heads of the institutions, allowing the latter to appoint the minor officials and employes. There is often found a provision prohibiting the members of the board from attempting to influence the superintendent in the appointing of the employes under him, in order to prevent the entrance of politics into the internal affairs of the institutions.

*Illinois—The Dual Type.* In Illinois there are two separate boards over the charitable institutions, one a board of administration, the other a charities commission. The board of administration consists of five members, appointed by the governor, who have executive and administrative control over all state charitable institutions excepting the prisons. It resembles the Iowa board in many respects. Its fiscal power is emphasized, and one member, styled fiscal supervisor, has special charge over the finances of the institutions. He inspects the books and provides a uniform method of accounting, examines the condition of the buildings and grounds and supervises the making of repairs. Act-

ing with a committee of the superintendents, he has charge of purchasing supplies by contract. The superintendents submit monthly estimates and the fiscal supervisor revises these, always referring important matters to the whole board. The board appoints the heads of the institutions, and fixes their salaries. It also establishes a graded scale of wages for the minor officials, who hold office under the civil service plan. The board in addition to its strictly administrative functions is also given power to inspect and investigate out-door poor relief, almshouses, children's homefinding societies, orphanages, lying-in hospitals and any place where persons are detained for treatment of nervous diseases; it also inspects county jails, city prisoms, workhouses, etc., and one of its duties is to collect statistical information concerning the inmates of all these institutions. It must visit each state institution at least quarterly. Each member receives a salary of \$6000 per year.

The charities commission consists of five members appointed by the governor, who receive no compensation. Its chief duty is to investigate the whole system of public charitable institutions of the State, examine into the management and condition thereof, especially of state hospitals and local jails and almshouses. In this it is quite similar to the Indiana board, having no mandatory powers. The charities commission may inquire, in its discretion, into the equipment, management and policies of all institutions and organizations coming under the supervision, administration or inspection of the board of administration. It maintains a special bureau of criminal statistics.

From this it is seen that the board of administration handles the business details of the state institutions and supervises certain other organizations, while the function of the charities commission is purely supervisory. The business of the former is primarily with institutions and organizations; the latter studies the whole charity problem in its broad aspects. The former has the responsibility for the management of each institution, its methods, both along fiscal lines and in the care of inmates; the latter is in these matters only a checking agency, but without powers which would bring the two boards into conflict. It would seem at first sight that the charities commission was simply a system of espionage upon the acts of the administrative board, but such does not seem to have been the experience of Illinois. The law was framed to create a harmonious system, not to establish two antagonistic boards. The charities commission, it is found, has a definite, separate sphere. Its valuable contribution to charity work lies in its educational policy. It holds quarterly conferences with the heads of the

institutions and other influential charity workers at which the more advanced problems are discussed. The reports and findings of the conference are published in a quarterly bulletin which is widely distributed throughout the State. Moreover, the supervisory board has an important influence over private charity organizations, and its opinions and advice have considerable weight with such societies, while on the whole this board tends to bring the private organizations into closer touch with the work of the State. The administrative board has a distinctly different attitude. It has power to compel many of the local institutions to conform to its recommendations and throughout the idea of its superior authority is predominant. The board of administration brings fiscal efficiency into the state institutions; the charities commission creates a uniform attitude throughout the State on all charity problems and secures cooperation between all the charity agencies, public or private, while it fosters and educates public opinion not only on the practical problems before the State, but also on the advanced methods which it is seeking to introduce and the more enlightened and scientific case and treatment of all classes of inmates, not only while in institutions, but after they have left, and on methods of prevention.

The distinguishing feature of the dual system lies in the existence of two boards over the same institutions. One board is purely supervisory or advisory. The other may have either complete control over the affairs of the institution, or administrative powers in fiscal matters only. The Illinois system is virtually a harmonious combination of the Indiana and Iowa boards.

#### CLASSIFICATION OF EXISTING STATE SYSTEMS

Six States have no state board for the supervision of charities. These are Idaho, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico, Oregon and Utah. Five States have no other board besides a prison commission and in most of these States the boards are merely trustees for one or two institutions. But since these boards are state boards over that field which is particularly pressing in these States, and in a limited way do exercise supervision and administration over state charities, these boards have been included in the following classification and the state systems have been classified as though the board were fully a charity board over more than one field.

Fifteen States in the United States are essentially of the Iowa type. They are Arizona, Arkansas, Florida, Georgia, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Texas, Washington, West



Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming. Three of these are what are known as "ex-officio" boards; they consist of officials who already hold an office under the State, and the boards thus made up are not considered of great value in charity work. Arkansas, Georgia and Texas have only a single board of prison commissioners, with no state supervision in other fields. And their powers in that one field are inferior to the powers of the Iowa board. Kansas has two separate boards, one over the prisons and reformatories, the other over the charitable institutions and insane hospitals. Each board is similar in powers and functions to the Iowa board. Montana also has a second board, the board of commissioners for the insane, which is identical with the board of prison commissioners in personnel, and is therefore hardly to be considered an entirely different board, but rather the same board given a different name for its new functions.

There are sixteen States which are essentially of the Indiana or supervisory type. They are: Alabama, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Missouri, New Jersey, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. Of these, twelve are strictly after the Indiana type; that is, they have a single board of supervision over all charitable institutions. These are Colorado, Connecticut, Indiana, Louisiana, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee and Virginia. A sub-committee of the Pennsylvania board, however, is practically an administrative board for the insane institutions. Delaware has a commission of two members, styled board of supervisors of state and county institutions in New Castle County. Although operating in only one of the three counties of the State, this is really a state board, created by the State and presumably confined to the county where the state's charity problem is most felt.

There are now eleven States which may possibly be classed under the dual system. These are California, Illinois, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Dakota and Vermont. Of these only Illinois and Ohio are at all similar in the organization and functions given the boards, though the fiscal side of the state systems of New Hampshire and Vermont are very similar. The Ohio system was quite obviously modeled after the Illinois plan, although one essential change was made, the fiscal supervisor in Ohio not being a member of the board but merely an employee. In all the other States the conditions found are peculiar to that State.

The first fact in conclusion that seems self-evident is that the idea of centralizing or consolidating the administrative side of state institutions is now in great favor and is increasing in popularity. Since 1900 out of twenty-two boards created, fourteen were administrative; only nine supervisory boards being established in that time. The figures are much more striking if we consider the period within the past five or six years. Since 1908 only two supervisory boards have been established in what is strictly the field of charitable institutions. During the same period nine administrative boards have been created in that field. (Some of these administrative boards being in the dual system, of course.) Again, in the governors' messages for 1915 the governors of four States definitely urge the creation of an administrative board to have full control over state institutions. In only one State did the governor recommend the creation of a supervisory board, although the governor of Missouri in his message opposed the board of control idea. Hence there is clearly a very definite and positive tendency at present towards the centralization of the control of state institutions.

FREDERICK H. GUILD.

*University of Illinois.*

**Mechanical Registration of Legislative Votes.** Among the numerous devices developed and perfected for the regulation of legislative procedure, none is deserving of more thoughtful consideration than the installation of mechanical devices for the registration of the votes of the members of the legislative assembly. State constitutions invariably provide that an aye and no vote must be taken on the final passage of every measure. The time consumed in calling the roll, even by an energetic roll clerk, to ascertain whether a quorum is present, to suspend a constitutional rule, and on the passage of acts and resolutions, amounts in the aggregate to several days for each session. This traditional method is not only monotonous, burdensome and depressing, but it consumes time to no useful purpose and is particularly unsatisfactory in those States where the sessions are fixed by the constitution and where they have proved to be far too short to dispose the necessary business which the growth of modern industry has imposed upon legislative bodies. Wisconsin has taken one of the first steps to eliminate the traditional time-consuming practice of roll-calls. By an act approved July 29, 1915, the capitol building commission is required to purchase and install "an electrical and mechanical system for the instantaneous registration of the votes of the members of the